

## REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action dated December 4, 2006. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 8, 11, 18 and 21 and cancelled claims 12, 23 and 25 to more clearly point out the present inventive concept. Reconsideration of the claims, as amended, and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the written restriction requirement. Applicant has amended claim 21 to remove the language “undefined network address.” Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 8, 11, 13, 18 and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(3) as being anticipated by *Russell*. Claim 1 has been amended to more particularly recite:

determining an IP address of the client at the server system;  
determining, at the server system, a geographic location associated with the determined IP network address of the client system;  
confirming, at the server system, that the determined geographic location associated with the IP network address is associated with an authorized geographic location;

Thus, Claim 1 describes a process wherein a determination of the IP network address, the determination of the geographic location associated with the IP address and the confirmation that the determined geographic location is associated with an authorized geographic location all occur at the server system with which the client system is requesting a resource. Thus, all geographic location authorization associated with the process are performed by the server system enabling the process to be validated without the necessity of transmitting authorization requests from the server system to outside entities.

On the contrary, the *Russell* system clearly describes the use of an external entity for confirmation that the IP address is within an authorized geographic location. Paragraph 91 of the *Russell* reference specifically describes “the main server 12 passes the users IP address to the

traceware service, or other suitable geographic locator system.” Thus, the server described with respect to the *Russell* reference utilizes an external service in order to perform the geographic location wherein Applicant’s system describes performing this service internally within the server system. Claim 11 includes limitations similar to those of Claim 1 and is allowable over the *Russell* reference for similar reasons. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1 and 11, and all claims dependent therefrom, is respectfully requested.

Claims 8 and 18 have been amended to include the limitation of:

generating a geographic location of the client system at the client system;

sending the generated geographic location of the client system to the system server over the IP network;

selectively receiving access to the server resource on the IP network depending on validation of the client system by the server system by confirming the generated geographic location corresponds to an authorized geographic location.

These limitations are not disclosed by *Russell*. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 8 and 18, and all claims dependent therefrom, are distinguishable from the art of record and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, 16, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Russell* in view of *Alcorn*. These claims, being dependent upon previously discussed claims 1 or 11, or cancelled, are allowable over the combination of *Russell* and *Alcorn* as the *Alcorn* reference fails to overcome the shortcomings of *Russell*.

Claims 5, 9 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of *Joao*. These claims, being dependent upon previously discussed claims 1 or 11, or cancelled, are allowable for similar reasons as the *Joao* reference fails to overcome the shortcomings of *Russell*.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Russell* in view of *Thompson*. Claim 21 includes the step of:

determining at the server a network address of the client system;  
defining at the server a geographic location associated with the network address;  
confirming at the server that the geographic location associated with the network address is associated with an authorized geographic location;

For reasons similar to those discussed with respect to Claim 1, the process of performing each of these steps at the server system is not disclosed by the *Russell* reference. Furthermore, the *Thompson* reference does not overcome the shortcomings of *Russell*. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 21 is allowable over the art of record, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/PAYT-26,278 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,  
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicant

/Brian D. Walker, Reg. #37,751/  
Brian D. Walker  
Registration No. 37,751

BDW/dd

P.O. Box 741715  
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715  
Tel: 972-479-0462  
Fax: 972-479-0464  
June 4, 2007